BARRICK MERCUR GOLD MINE

June 18, 1990

Mr. Lowell P. Braxton
Associate Director, Mining
Division of Oil, Gas & Mining
Utah Department of Natural Resources
Suite 350
3 Triad Center
355 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203

Dear Mr. Braxton:

Subject: M/045/017-88(1), Tooele County, Utah

Please accept this correspondence as Barrick's response to your letter dated May 21, 1990 requesting clarification of certain outstanding issues. Each line item has been addressed and supported with supplemental information as required.

Please note that the wildlife impact mitigation plan will also be transmitted to the Division of Wildlife Resources for their files. We trust that, with this submittal, all outstanding conditional issues will be resolved and formal approval of the M&RP can be granted upon expiration of the public notice comment period on June 24, 1990.

Barrick continues to welcome the Division's longstanding cooperation in resolving these permitting issues and looks forward to a successful implementation period.

Respectfully,

Glenn M. Eurick

Environmental Affairs Coordinator (USA)

GME/cg

cc: F. D. Wicks

C. L. Landa

E. E. Maurer

T. B. Faddies

M. P. Richardson

R. R. Sacrison

D. P. Beatty

H. Hedrick (BLM)

J. Urbanik (Tooele County)

B. Buck (JBR Consultants

R 613-004-106.2 - Operation Plan

Barrick will perform a series of acid-base potential analyses on the material being mined from the Sacramento Hill Pit, to be placed on the Sunrise Dump. The initial analyses will be performed on the existing pulp samples obtained during development drilling of the area. These samples will be analyzed for calcium (calculated for calcium carbonate CaCO₃) and sulfur (calculated for sulfide) using the methods shown in attachment No. 1, Barrick Mercur Laboratory analysis procedures. The results of these analyses will be used to determine acid forming potential of the sulfide in the presence of calcium carbonate (acid neutralization potential). The initial sampling plan, geologic origin and stratigraphic occurrence of the samples are shown in attachment No. 2 (memo to D.P. Beatty from L.W. Stanger).

Barrick is requesting an additional 90 days to prepare and analyze the samples and produce results of the acid forming potential. Any selective material handling will be addressed, if necessary, following the results of testing.

R 613-004-107.5 - Soils

As suggested by the Division, a rip-rapped earthen berm will be constructed in place of silt fence 6, north of topsoil stockpile T15, and will be used to divert runoff water to the west side of stockpile T15 into the drainage channel described in previous correspondence. This work will be completed by the end of July 1990.

Topsoil stockpiles T9 and T12 have been replaced on map 2.4-2, post reclamation configuration, along with the intended location of stockpile T18. As indicated in previous text, T12 will be relocated to T13 location and T9 will be relocated to T18 proposed location. The updated version of this map is included as attachment No. 3.

All topsoil stockpile volumes and stockpile changes from 1986 through May 1990 are shown in attachment No. 4, topsoil stockpile activity table. As indicated in the table, 916,575 cubic yards of topsoil have been stockpiled as of May 31, 1990.

The discrepancies shown in total topsoil volume required at final reclamation between page 51b of the plan (1,091,194 cu. yds.) and page 60, table 2.4-3 (1,495,551 cu. yds.) is simply a mathematical error on table 2.4-3 (page 60) which inadvertently included the subsoil and clay volumes in the "total topsoil required" volume. In addition, the requirements to reclaim 31.3 acres of roads were left off of table 2.4-3 (page 60). The correct figures are those presented on page 51b of the plan equalling 1,091,194 cubic yards of topsoil as the reclamation requirement.

As shown in attachment No. 4, Topsoil Stockpile Activity Table, the current stockpiled inventory (May 1990) equals 916,575 cubic yards,

which is a deficit of 174,619 cubic yards in reclamation requirement. This deficit will be decreased with additional topsoil salvage in the following locations:

```
1991-92 Tailing Dam Construction (20,000 cu. yds., est.)
1990 North Marion Hill Pit Stripping (20,000 cu. yds., est.)
1990 Sacramento Pit Stripping (15,000 cu. yds., est.)
```

This leaves a net topsoil deficit of approximately 119,619 cubic yards, if no additional topsoil is salvaged. Prior to final reclamation, the deficit will be resolved using the best available subsoil and changes in revegetation techniques, such as alternate plant species and modified fertilizer blends to compensate for the lower grade soils.

R 613-004-109 - Impact Assessment

The Wildlife Impact Mitigation plan has been revised pursuant to site and regulatory modifications and is incorporated into the existing MRP at page 62.

R 613-004-110 - Reclamation Plan

The design details for the conceptual closure and post-closure monitoring plan for Dump Leach Area 3 will be negotiated among Barrick, the Division, and the Bureau of Water Pollution Control as a result of overlapping regulatory control. Pursuant to our groundwater discharge permit, this deadline will be on or about September 9, 1990.

In response to the two specific concerns by the division in the Tentative Approval notice, conceptually Barrick will line the 10 foot wide diversion channels to minimize erosional impacts, and fill in the two impoundment structures up drainage from Dump Leach 3 with waste rock, forming an adequate free draining system from upper Meadow Canyon and Dead Horse Canyon around Dump Leach 3.

R 613-004-111 - Reclamation Practices

The reclamation requirements for the tailing pond at final mine closure is unknown at this time, however, Barrick is committed to continue researching viable options for reclamation of the tailing facility until such time as a suitable plan is realized. Barrick will submit a detailed tailing pond reclamation plan to the division for approval at least 12 months prior to ultimate mine closure.

R 613-004-113 - Surety

Barrick awaits the division's analysis of our reclamation cost estimate and self-bonding qualification calculations.